UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
07/728,428	07/11/1991	JO ANN M. CANICH	89B010-D-1	5216
	7590 03/20/200 L CHEMICAL COMP		EXAM	INER
5200 BAYWAY DRIVE			RABAGO, ROBERTO	
P.O. BOX 2149 BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	07/728,428	CANICH, JO ANN M.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roberto Rábago	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statue Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron ute, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ The 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pr		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 27,44-52,54-56,60-74,77-124 and 1 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) 27,44-47 and 122 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 48-50,54-56,60-63,66,83-113,115-1 7) ☐ Claim(s) 48,51,52,64-74,77-82,88,105,114,1 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and. Application Papers	rawn from consideration. 121,123,124 and 126-132 is/are re 17 and 121 is/are objected to.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according a deplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected.	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 07/728,428 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Independent claims 48, 64-68 and 70-74 are directed to a product which is not rejected over prior art or double patenting. In anticipation of applicant correcting the minor issues set forth below with respect to these claims, pursuant to the procedures set forth in MPEP § 821.04(B), claims 83-121 and 127-132, directed to the process of making or using an allowable product, previously withdrawn from consideration as a result of a restriction requirement, are hereby rejoined and fully examined for patentability under 37 CFR 1.104.

Because all claims previously withdrawn from consideration under 37 CFR 1.142 have been rejoined, the restriction requirement as set forth in the Office action mailed on 2/23/2007 is hereby withdrawn. In view of the withdrawal of the restriction requirement as to the rejoined inventions, applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Once the restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Application/Control Number: 07/728,428 Page 3

Art Unit: 1796

Claim Objections

2. Claims 48, 64-68, 70-74, 88, 105, 117, and 121 are objected to. Each claim has been amended to include "x is 1, 2, 3or 4"; the claims are objected to because applicants have failed to properly space "3or". Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. Claims 48-50, 54-56, 60-63, 66, 83, 102, 103, 123, 124, and 126-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- (a) In claim 48, and claims 49-50, 54-56, 60-63, 83, 123, 124, and 126-132 as dependent thereon, the meaning of Z in "when M is Hf or Z" cannot be determined. It would appear that the intended metal should have been Zr.
- (b) Claim 66 is indefinite in the limitation "when M is Ti" because earlier in the claim M had been limited to Zr or Hf.
- (c) Claims 102 and 103 are indefinite because the claims do not indicate what type of "series" is intended.

Double Patenting

4. Claims 88-98, 100, 101, and 104 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,205,364. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

Application/Control Number: 07/728,428 Page 4

Art Unit: 1796

patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims set forth substantially the same process as the patented claims when y=0, and therefore the patented claims anticipate instant claims 88-97. The additional selections required in claims 98, 100, and 101 are obvious because they represent nothing more than the most conventional choices for operating an olefin polymerization. Regarding claim 104, the stated distribution would inherently be obtained simply by operating the process as stated in the patented claims.

5. Claims 83-113, 115-121, and 129-131 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of copending Application No. 11/387,217. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims set forth substantially the same process as the copending claims, and therefore the copending claims anticipate instant claims 83-113, 115-117, 119, 121, 129 and 130. The additional selections required in claims 118, 120 and 131 are obvious because they are shown in the working examples which provide support for the claims. The courts have stated that those portions of the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a claim in the application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 441-42, 164 USPQ 619, 622 (CCPA 1970).

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 27, 44-47 and 122 are allowed.

Claims 51, 52, 69, 77-82 and 114 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberto Rábago whose telephone number is (571) 272-1109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Roberto Rábago/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1796

RR March 15, 2008